

Remarks

In the present RCE, claims 1-39 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 101

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 USC § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully assert that these rejections are moot in view of the amendments to claim 19. First, claim 19 is amended to recite a “tangible” medium. Second, claim 19 is amended to affirmatively recite that the management system “stores” the baseline version and “stores” the delta version.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 112

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description. Applicants respectfully assert that this rejection is moot since claim 40 is canceled.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 112

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully assert that this rejection is moot since claim 41 is canceled.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(b) and 103(a)

Claims 1-35 and 40 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 5,870,765 (Bauer). Claims 36-39 and 41 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer in view of US publication number 2004/0078602 (Rothbarth). These rejections are traversed.

The independent claims recite numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Bauer. By way of example, claim 1 is amended to recite processing circuitry that “outputs the delta version to the other of the storage devices after determining that insufficient storage capacity exists at the one of the storage devices to store the delta version.” By contrast, Bauer teaches synchronization between a server and a client computer. The client computer sends modifications of a client table to the server by determining what changes occurred to the client table. Bauer does not teach or even

suggest that the client computer sends such modifications after determining that insufficient storage capacity exists at the client computer to store the modifications. In Bauer, the client computer already has the modifications stored. After storing the modifications, the client sends them to the server.

For at least these reasons, the claims are allowable over Bauer in view of Rothbarth.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529